

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4, 8-14, and 18-25 remain pending in the application. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

Miscellaneous Note Regarding IDS Forms

The Applicant notes that the PTO-1449 form that the Examiner faxed to the Applicant on 5/18/2009, showing consideration of references GA-GP filed with an IDS on 3/25/2008 and of references HA-HC filed with an IDS on 5/18/2009 are not shown as part of this matter's file history on PAIR. The Applicant respectfully requests that these forms be included in the file history on PAIR.

Allowable Subject Matter and Claims 13-14

On pages 9-12 of the 07/23/2009 Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 1-4, 8-12, 18, and 19 are allowed. On page 12, the Examiner stated that claim 25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In the Office Action, the Examiner did not specifically address claims 13-14, which are indicated as allowed in the Office Action Summary, form PTOL-326, accompanying the Office Action, and which depend variously from allowed claim 1. The Applicant respectfully requests that claims 13-14 be specifically indicated as allowed in the detailed action.

Prior-Art Rejections

On pages 2-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 20, 23, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0009582 A1 to Qiao et al. ("Qiao"), in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,130,875 to Doshi et al. ("Doshi"). On pages 7-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Qiao and Doshi in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,904,462 B1 to Sinha ("Sinha").

Claims 20 and 24

In rejecting claim 20, the Examiner argued that the combination of Qiao and Doshi discloses all of the features of claim 20. In particular, the Examiner asserted that the combination teaches the feature of “for each link of a specified set of links in the network: . . . (3) reducing the link’s assigned initial cost when it is determined that the link’s bandwidth can be shared with the new restoration path.” The Applicant submits that the proposed combination would not teach this feature.

Qiao purports to disclose a distributed control scheme for dynamic allocation and de-allocation of bandwidth (*see, e.g.*, Qiao Abstract). The Examiner cited paragraph 58 of Qiao as specifically teaching this feature. The Examiner asserted that paragraph 58 of Qiao teaches “minimizing the bandwidth when determining that the connection’s bandwidth shared with the new connection.” First, the Applicant notes that paragraph 58 describes a so-called “No-Sharing scheme” as follows: “As the name suggests, there is no bandwidth sharing among the backup connections when using this scheme” (emphasis added) (Qiao, paragraphs 57-58). Consequently, it cannot be said that paragraph 58 of Qiao teaches anything about sharing bandwidth. Second, neither paragraph 58, nor any other section of Qiao, teaches reducing a link’s assigned initial cost under any circumstances, let alone when it is determined that the link’s bandwidth can be shared with the new restoration path. Consequently, it cannot be said that the cited references teach this requisite feature of claim 20.

In rejecting claim 20, the Examiner argued that Doshi teaches the feature of “calculating the minimum-cost restoration path for the new primary path using the specified set of links, wherein the cost of the minimum-cost restoration path is based on the sum of the costs of the links of the minimum-cost restoration path.” The Applicant further submits that the combination does not teach the above-quoted requisite feature of claim 20.

In this regard, note that the Examiner cited Fig. 16B and column 30, lines 50-62, of Doshi as specifically teaching this feature. However, the cited sections refer to capacity, not cost. These cited sections say nothing about link costs, let alone a minimum-cost restoration path or the sum of the costs of the links of a minimum-cost restoration path. Thus, the rejection of claim 20 based on these cited sections is improper.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant submits that claim 20 is allowable over the cited references. For similar reasons, the Applicant submits that claim 24 is also allowable over the

cited references. Since claims 21-23 depend variously from claim 20, and claim 25 depends from claim 24, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over the cited references.

Claim 23

In rejecting claim 23, the Examiner argued that the combination of Qiao and Doshi teaches all of the claimed features of claim 23. In particular, the Examiner argued that Doshi teaches a method wherein (1) “a path pair cost is generated for each candidate primary path as the sum of the path cost of the candidate primary path and the path cost of the corresponding minimum-cost restoration path,” and the method further comprises (2) “selecting (i) a candidate primary path from the set of candidate primary paths and (ii) the corresponding minimum-cost restoration path that together have the lowest path pair cost.”

The Examiner cited column 33, lines 14-20, of Doshi as specifically teaching the above-quoted requisite features. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action mischaracterizes Doshi. The cited section of Doshi actually discusses free capacities on links. Free capacities are not examples of path costs. Thus, the cited section says nothing about costs, let alone (a) generating a path pair cost as the sum of the path cost of a candidate primary path and the path cost of a corresponding minimum-cost restoration path or (b) selecting a candidate primary path and a corresponding minimum-cost restoration path that together have the lowest path pair cost. As a result, the rejection of claim 23 is improper.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that this provides further grounds for the allowability of claim 23 over the cited references.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, the Applicant believes that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Fees

During the pendency of this application, the Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment of any filing fees for presentation of extra claims under 37 CFR

1.16 and any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR 1.17 or credit any overpayment to **Mendelsohn, Drucker, & Associates, P.C.** Deposit Account No. 50-0782.

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to treat any concurrent or future reply, requiring a petition for extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 for its timely submission, as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time if not submitted with the reply.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 06 – OCT – 2009

Customer No. 46850

Mendelsohn, Drucker, & Associates, P.C.

1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

/Edward J. Meisarosh/

Edward J. Meisarosh

Registration No. 57,463

Attorney for Applicant

(215) 599-3639 (phone)

(215) 557-8477 (fax)